

**REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the outstanding Office Action dated February 8, 2006.

The Examiner has objected to the abstract of the disclosure. The abstract of the disclosure has been corrected in order to overcome the objection.

Further, the Examiner has stated that title of the invention is not descriptive and a new title is required. The title has been replaced with a new title as suggested by the Examiner.

Furthermore, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure and the specification under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to provide an adequate written description. The specification has been corrected to overcome the objection and no new matter has been introduced.

Moreover, the Examiner has objected to claim 1 because of informalities. The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 3 and 4 in order to overcome the rejection.

In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 on the ground of nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Tsai (US 6,793,431) in view of Nakajima et al (US 5,803,640). Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 3 and 4 and a terminal disclaimer is attached herewith for overcoming the rejection.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leong C. Lei".

Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

June 8, 2006